

RELIGIOUS.

**AMERICAN EDUCATION SOCIETY.**  
A few weeks ago, at a public meeting in Connecticut, the writer heard the respected Secretary of the above mentioned Institution, in pleading his cause, propound and affirm the question:—Is the American Education Society any longer needed to supply our churches with ministers? This was a painful inquiry to realize the necessity, that an Institution like this, which has been a favorite with the churches, which has been so useful in the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom, which has done more than any human means, for the last quarter of a century, to elevate the character of the ministry in our land, and which has been instrumental in the work of missions, in revivals of religion and the salvation of the soul, should be flung on its defence; yet it seemed then, as now, necessary, to ask and answer the question. The two following objections, found in the minds of some few ministers and of some good people, have created the necessity: objections, which a pastor in laying his claims before some neighboring congregations found it needful to meet—viz. 1. *The are unchristian ministers.* 2. *The are in great abundance in our country, and need to supply the demand.* 3. *The are unchristian ministers of our country, to which the American Education Society has contributed so much in number, and not the high-talent, piety, and self-sacrificing of former times.* Allow me, Mr. Editor, to dwell for a little space in your valuable paper on these objections, as propounded to some observers, and showing directly the inoperative necessity of this excellent institution, at this very time.

1st. The first objection, the abundance of ministers, has much more plausibility and pretence than truth, as will appear on a thorough examination. Let us make abatement from this abundance, for the ministers employed as Editors of religious periodicals; next for the Secretaries of our benevolent institutions, and then for the necessary Agents and operators of the great plans of benevolence. We will next make allowance for those who hold important posts of Presidents and Professors in our Theological and Collegiate institutions, and for those usefully employed, as teachers in public and private seminaries, and in our benevolent institutions, and then for the necessary Agents and operators of the great plans of benevolence. We will next make allowance for those who hold important posts of Presidents and Professors in our Theological and Collegiate institutions, and for those usefully employed, as teachers in public and private seminaries, and in our benevolent institutions, and then for the necessary Agents and operators of the great plans of benevolence.

2nd. The second objection, the abundance of ministers, has much more plausibility and pretence than truth, as will appear on a thorough examination. Let us make abatement from this abundance, for the ministers employed as Editors of religious periodicals; next for the Secretaries of our benevolent institutions, and then for the necessary Agents and operators of the great plans of benevolence. We will next make allowance for those who hold important posts of Presidents and Professors in our Theological and Collegiate institutions, and for those usefully employed, as teachers in public and private seminaries, and in our benevolent institutions, and then for the necessary Agents and operators of the great plans of benevolence.

**HARVARD COLLEGE.**  
SHALL I SEND MY SON TO HARVARD COLLEGE?—[Continued.]  
My next reason for the advice here given relates rather to yourself, than to your son. You have been educated in the Christian religion, and sent from the religiously inculcated by modern Unitarians. You have represented their system as defective and dangerous, and justified those who have come out and separated themselves from it. Now, suppose, after all this, you send your son to be educated at Harvard College, and place him under the guidance and influence of Unitarian instructors. What use, think you, would be made of such a procedure? Would it not be said at once, "See how much in earnest Mr. — is, in the censures which he passes upon Unitarianism. He does not think so unfavorably of our religion, after all. If he really believed our views to be essentially wrong, and that the Unitarian system was a delusion, he would have sent his son to some other place, where he could have the education of his son? Would he place his own child under our direction and care and commit to us the formation of his mind, if he seriously regarded us as in fatal error? Impossible! These Orthodox pretensions may say what they please. Their actions are inconsistent with their declarations, and render them unworthy of regard." I well know, my dear Sir, what has been said in similar cases; and I know as well what would be said, and said with no little show of reason, should you decide to place your son at Harvard. You must expect, as the result of such a measure, not only to have your sincerity and consistency impeached, but to have your influence, in favor of truth and in opposition to prevailing error, be completely obstructed.

3rd. The third objection, the abundance of ministers, has much more plausibility and pretence than truth, as will appear on a thorough examination. Let us make abatement from this abundance, for the ministers employed as Editors of religious periodicals; next for the Secretaries of our benevolent institutions, and then for the necessary Agents and operators of the great plans of benevolence. We will next make allowance for those who hold important posts of Presidents and Professors in our Theological and Collegiate institutions, and for those usefully employed, as teachers in public and private seminaries, and in our benevolent institutions, and then for the necessary Agents and operators of the great plans of benevolence.

**THE ENERGETIC MAGISTRATE.**  
He is bound to the accused man, whether innocent or not, to give him a full and fair opportunity to defend himself, and to do it without delay. Seldom does there occur, under a civilized government, a case of more gross and deliberate wrong, than in the long imprisonment which precedes trial, in some instances, to the fact that the magistrate is not a man of despatch; and thus malice has gratified itself with the sufferings of innocence. The magistrate owes it to every tempted man, to rattle on his heart the firmest assurance, not only that the wicked shall not go unpunished, but that the punishment shall be summary. It is the kindest favor that can be bestowed upon the tempted man, to show him that he cannot escape, even for a short time. Such is the necessary solution to anger, in the divine retributions, during the period of a merciful probation, that "sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily," by the hand of the Lord;—and in this delay, the wicked find a motive to have "their heart fully set in them to do evil." But God has raised over the tempted soul the arm of his own authority, in the person of the magistrate, who is bound to make fully understood that his arm will sound without delay. This arrangement is an expression of our heavenly Father's kindness, by which he would keep us back from presumptuous sin. Should the magistrate, by a dilatory habit of business, encourage the hope of one tempted that he may escape, he would make himself an accessory to crime, in the sight of God.

**FOUNDATION OF THE MAGISTRACY.**  
The Christian church, and the Christian ministry, are bound to withdraw from every brother, as "walking disorderly," who cries out against the lawfulness of human government, and contends that magistracy was the necessary production of the dark ages, and should pass away with the twilight of the world. And every institution of learning, from the highest to the lowest, and every family circle, and every other source of influence, should be laid under contribution, to sustain the opinion, that magistracy is an institution of God, important and essential to the welfare of man; that without magistracy, we are without law; and without law we are without rights and liberties; and in such a state every individual will be left in direct violation of Scripture, to resist for himself, to take an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; to be his own judge, and his own jury; his own sheriff, and his own jailor.

**THE MISSION IN TURKEY.**  
Letter to the Secretary of the American Tract Society.  
CONSTANTINOPLE, May 26, 1841.  
"DEAR BROTHERS,—We address the American Tract Society on behalf of the annual meeting of the Mission in Turkey, at present assembled in this city. By a report laid before this meeting, work has been done since January 1, on the Society's account, to the amount of considerably more than \$1000, which exhausts all the funds committed to our hands; and we now come to state to you, as to generous friends, what are our prospects and wants for the coming year, and may God enable and incline you to afford us all needed help. "We can truly say that we never have felt before so much our need of your help. We have never seen in Turkey a time of such demand for our books. The past year has witnessed a remarkable advance in this respect among the Armenians. The Holy Spirit is evidently operating among that people at Constantinople, Broussa, Nicomedia and Trebizond, and many eagerly read books and Tracts of the most decidedly religious character. How long this state of things may continue, none can foresee. But let us make the best use of this golden opportunity, by introducing into this community as many good books and Tracts as possible. Once introduced, the power of man can wholly remove them again. Many of the people will resort to every expedient for retaining them. For example—at Erzerang, a town in the far interior, just before the last persecution, a priest had received some of our books. Once came for all such books to be delivered up, but he would not give them up, and he hid them in a place of security until the time should be overpast. The same man was here last February, and procured seventy more of our books, which fifty-eight were your publications. He was then on his return to Erzerang, and was intending to raise the buried books from the grave and give them circulation.



## BOSTON RECORDER.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 20, 1841.

## AMERICAN HOME MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

It has been shown from published documents, that if New England Congregationalists did not originate, they at least approved, and forwarded by their counsels and prayers, the formation of the A. H. M. S. Their precise share in the honor of originating it, we have not the desire nor the means of ascertaining. It is enough, however to know, that in the spirit of primitive Christianity, they regarded neither Paul nor Apollos—neither Presbyterianism nor Congregationalism—but Christ only, and the extension of his kingdom. Herein lies the chief honor of their movements.

We yield to none in our attachments to Congregationalism. We love its simplicity, venerate its antiquity, and admire its unobtrusiveness. We defer to it as scriptural, honor it as coming from our fathers, respect it as the surest bulwark of religious liberty, and cleave to it as a main bulwark of the faith once delivered to the saints.

But when we have said this, we are not ready to turn upon a brother in Christ, who thinks differently from us, and reject him as a fellow-laborer, and say to him, "Stand by thyself, for I am holier than thou." The spirit of sectarianism is our abhorrence; and whether it be seen in Presbyterian or Baptist, Episcopal or Congregationalist, we say to it involuntarily, *Avant!*

And thus felt the good men who met in Boston to aid in the formation of the A. H. M. S. in January, 1826. Most of them, thank God, yet live to bear testimony to this, and the names of the lamented Porter, Church, Cornelius and Wisner will be decorated by no man who knew them, by the imputation of sectarianism.

And the same has been true of the whole body of Congregationalists, from the first settlement of New England. Their eye has been fixed on the preservation and increase of true religion, not on the advancement of Congregationalism. They have been content with an humble instrumentality in converting sinners to Christ, even though their converts have afterwards fallen into the ranks of other denominations, and gone to swell the hosts that obey the dictums of a sectarian leader. They may have been grieved, and given vent to their tears in secret places, over the fully taken refuge under sectarian banners; but they have not complained, nor desisted from their ill-requited works of faith and labors of love, though fear of adding strength to a rival and unscrupulous denomination.

The prevalence of this noble and disinterested spirit is marked in the "Instructions" given to missionaries by every Congregational Missionary Society in New England. Those instructions enjoin diligence and fidelity in inculcating the doctrines and duties of religion, and the avoidance of interference with other denominations—but say nothing of efforts to promote Congregationalism. If this be a defect, yet as Congregationalists, we glory in it—if it render us vile, we shall assuredly become yet more vile.

We are told that "Home Missionary Societies are building up Presbyterian churches wherever they can." Where is the proof of this? What Home Missionary Societies are doing it? The Presbyterian Board is doing it no doubt. And who can complain, any more than when a Baptist Board or a Methodist Board, or an Episcopal Board do it. They act consistently. The shibboleth of sectarianism is on their tongues. But the Home Missionary Societies of New England are not doing it, nor is the A. H. M. S. doing it. Or, if they are, we demand the proof. That Presbyterian missionaries are sent out is true, and why should they not be sent? Presbyterians support them. Congregational Missionaries are sent out also, and some of them turn Presbyterians. What then? The fault is their own, not that of the Society—and to affirm on this account that the Society is doing what it can to build up Presbyterian churches, is not quite fair. It is all equal to the Society, whether Presbyterian or Congregational churches are established, if so be "the truth as it is in Jesus" be maintained; and any man of either denomination is assisted with equal readiness, if he possess a fair character and the requisite qualifications for usefulness. Still the union between Presbyterians and Congregationalists is deemed "unfortunate." We are glad it is not pronounced sinful; though if it has done much to introduce confusion and heresy into both denominations, where the union exists, it is clearly something more than unfortunate. For ourselves however, it is difficult to admit that it is unfortunate even; on the contrary, we consider it as one of the most pleasing signs of these dark times, and a kind interposition of heaven for the conveyance of all the blessings of the gospel to thousands, and hundreds of thousands, who but for its instrumentality, had still been sitting in the region of the shadow of death. We may mistake. And if so, will be thankful for correction. But our own belief is, that it has done more to break up the dead formalities of Presbyterianism, and diffuse the genial spirit of our venerated Congregational fathers, and establish and nurture Congregational churches, than all other instrumentalities combined—more by far, than could have been done by a separate Congregational organization, which must have encountered the strongest prejudices of a very threshold of its undertaking, and fallen into collision with the most fervent piety and active devotedness of the west. And we would have this union sustained—not indeed for the incidental good that attends it, in the wide diffusion of the true Congregational spirit, but for the greater good it effects in the conversion of sinners, and the edification of saints.

The difficulties attending the faithful discharge of the duties of any of our benevolent Boards, are more numerous and delicate, than can readily be conceived by those who have never been called to meet them. And it can be no matter of surprise, if sometimes they disturb the equanimity of the most patient men, and so confound their judgment for a moment as to lead to unwise conduct. Not that we have ever heard a charge of this nature laid against any officer of the A. H. M. S. On the contrary, but one opinion of their wisdom and integrity has ever reached our ears. Still, it is more than possible that among several hundreds of missionaries, some have thought the appropriations made to them too small, or their fields of labor too hard, or their labors too lightly appreciated; and it is probable that some feeble churches have thought their claims not sufficiently weighed, or their interests not duly regarded; and these have cherished unbecoming jealousies of the Society that has aided them, and unfounded hopes, that under a different organization, they might share more largely in the charities of their sister churches. Such is human nature. And were angels the almoners of our benevolent contributions, they would not escape the scathing of such jealousies.

It is suspicion merely—but suspicion strong, that to cause like these, proximately or remotely, may be traced not a few of the suggestions recently made as to the expediency of attempting a new Congregational organization. We question not the purity of motive leading to this course, as it lies in the eye of the objector to the A. H. M. S., but only the clearness of the medium of vision.

But, we contend that such an organization cannot be effected without an expense of brotherly love, and a waste of moral power, that many years cannot repair. For fifteen years, all things have moved onward in an even and prosperous course; peace and harmony have characterized the councils and the measures of the friends of Home Missions; the Providence of God has smiled, and still smiles; the Holy Spirit has come down and breathed on thousands of the slain, so that they live; churches have been multiplied and edified; the happiest influences have gone abroad, and entered into all the ramifications of society, carrying with them order, love and joy; and consequently, the great majority of New England Congregationalists have become warmly attached to an institution of such bearing on the interests of Zion and their country; and that attachment cannot be broken, and its thousand cords bound around a new and untried organization in a moment. And why should it be broken? Or why should it be weakened? Who can tell? Nothing is laid to the charge of the A. H. M. S. worthy of death or of bonds. It does not indeed, convert men to Congregationalism as fast as might be wished; it does not hoist the flag of Congregationalism higher than that of Presbyterianism; but it unites the flags of both, and puts them in delightful harmony beneath the flag that waved on Calvary. And for this reason, the Congregationalists of New England as a body love it, and will never desert it "till they die."

If a new organization is attempted, it will doubtless find advocates; because there are always some in community who love the new wine better than the old—some who are never satisfied with what is, but always looking after what *may be*,—preferring a king, though it be Saul, to a judge, though it be Samuel. And there are others, whose prejudices may be wrought upon—whose jealousies may be aroused—whose ambition may be fired, and who may be persuaded that they are doing God service, when they agitate the churches to promote Congregationalism.

But some more heinous offence must be proved against the A. H. M. S. than that of provoking Presbyterians and Congregationalists to mutual good works, on the wide field of our country's moral desolations, before the sober and godly portion of our churches will tear themselves away from its support. But collisions of opinion and feeling must be the unavoidable consequence of an attempt at a new organization. Not that they will rend the churches as some other denominations have been rent asunder by similar measures, for Congregationalists "have not so learned Christ;" nor will their peculiar principles, and strong love of religious liberty allow them to indulge bitterness and strife on questions of mere policy; but even the heart of the righteous may be made sad by the waywardness of his brethren, and his hands may be enfeebled while serving the Lord by their antagonistic movements. And then, the effects that will be produced on thousands of minds in the destitute regions, where the battles of Congregationalism are to be fought—the array of church against church, family against family, and individual against individual, not for conscience sake, but for carrying out a system of doubtful policy, cannot fail to obstruct the progress of truth and righteousness, and give the enemy occasion to speak reproachfully of the Christian name.

Our views are very imperfectly exhibited, we are well aware. But it is only in the spirit of kindness that we write, while we profess the deepest concern for the welfare of Zion, and the true honor of the Congregationalism of our Fathers.

nor more like it than it is to Presbyterianism. And in both states there are wide diversities of theological views which will soon manifest themselves, on the formation of a new Society. We look for no such new thing under the sun as the cordial co-operation of distinct theological parties, in promoting a particular form of church order. They can harmonize, only like the iron and the clay in Nebuchadnezzar's image. Can we work with the Baptists in Home Missions? No. But why not? They are Congregationalists as well as we—nay "of the strictest sect"—and so are Unitarians; and so are Universalists—as good Congregationalists as any orthodox man in New-England. But we cannot work with them. Nor can the Taylorites and the rigid Hopkinsians work together in a distinct organization, though they have hitherto wrought harmoniously in their common relation to the American Home Missionary Society.

8. Congregationalism is already advancing at the West—and that too in the safest and surest manner possible,—by the strength of its own vital energies. This is admitted—nay urged by those who propose a new organization to promote its advancement. What more is wanted? Health is returning to the ecclesiastical body hitherto diseased. Restoration is certain, if not retarded by injudicious prescriptions. Why apply a nostrum that may quicken the operations of nature at the hazard of permanent injury to the constitution? It looks to us like the Finneyism and Buchardism that attempted a few years since to take the Lord's work out of his hand; and then did it up so bunglingly that even Satan laughs at it, as the verisimilitude of his own handy work. "Let patience have her perfect work."

9. The advance of Congregationalism by such means is not worth what it must cost. It seems to us, that there is a great mistake in regarding Congregationalism as the grand bulwark of evangelical religion. It is not so. It is the best form of government New England churches can have, no doubt. But its value does not consist in keeping "boasts and four footed things" out of its enclosures; it rather consists in leaving them free egress from its enclosures—which, however, they are not much inclined to improve. Presbyterianism, Episcopacy, &c. build their high and thick stone walls—and when an enemy gets in, it is hard work to get him out. Congregationalism has a fence around it of slight wicker work, which the enemy may leap over or break through at his pleasure, and over which he may be driven back with comparative ease. But who can pretend that Congregationalism is so mighty a bulwark of the truth, when Pelagianism, Unitarianism and Universalism and every other *ism* takes shelter within it, and feeds there securely. And so far as the churches of New England have been preserved from errors like these, it may not be clear that Congregationalism has preserved them. It is easy to affirm this, but not so easy to prove it. It is possible, to say the least, that the original stamp of New-England piety has done more to recommend Congregationalism, than Congregationalism has done to give or perpetuate the stamp of piety. Much as we value Congregationalism, it is not an idol to which we are prepared to bow down, and sacrifice the harmony and efficiency of the churches.

10. But collisions of opinion and feeling must be the unavoidable consequence of an attempt at a new organization. Not that they will rend the churches as some other denominations have been rent asunder by similar measures, for Congregationalists "have not so learned Christ;" nor will their peculiar principles, and strong love of religious liberty allow them to indulge bitterness and strife on questions of mere policy; but even the heart of the righteous may be made sad by the waywardness of his brethren, and his hands may be enfeebled while serving the Lord by their antagonistic movements. And then, the effects that will be produced on thousands of minds in the destitute regions, where the battles of Congregationalism are to be fought—the array of church against church, family against family, and individual against individual, not for conscience sake, but for carrying out a system of doubtful policy, cannot fail to obstruct the progress of truth and righteousness, and give the enemy occasion to speak reproachfully of the Christian name.

Our views are very imperfectly exhibited, we are well aware. But it is only in the spirit of kindness that we write, while we profess the deepest concern for the welfare of Zion, and the true honor of the Congregationalism of our Fathers.

11. Such a society is unnecessary. We have it already in the American Home Missionary Society, which is not more Presbyterian than Congregational. If we have a special desire that any portion, or the whole of our funds be appropriated exclusively to the support of Congregational churches, we have only to say so, and the American Home Missionary Society, is bound by its terms of relationship with Auxiliaries to appropriate them accordingly.

12. Such a society must involve needless expenditure of money. It must have its Secretary or Secretaries—its Treasurer—and its Agents; and all these must be supported from its funds. At the same time, the A. H. M. S. must retain all its present officers, even though its connexion with New-England be cut off. The multiplication of Societies for the same object is a great evil, as exhausting in their support a considerable portion of the public charities—and the good to be secured by their instrumentality, had still been sitting in the region of the shadow of death. We may mistake. And if so, will be thankful for correction. But our own belief is, that it has done more to break up the dead formalities of Presbyterianism, and diffuse the genial spirit of our venerated Congregational fathers, and establish and nurture Congregational churches, than all other instrumentalities combined—more by far, than could have been done by a separate Congregational organization, which must have encountered the strongest prejudices of a very threshold of its undertaking, and fallen into collision with the most fervent piety and active devotedness of the west. And we would have this union sustained—not indeed for the incidental good that attends it, in the wide diffusion of the true Congregational spirit, but for the greater good it effects in the conversion of sinners, and the edification of saints.

13. These two States have hitherto been unable to raise more than \$15,000 for expenditure on feeble churches beyond their own bounds. A new organization will not enable them to do more than this, even on the supposition that they shall be united and harmonious in action. But

14. They will not be thus united. The Society must have a location. That location may be Boston, or Worcester, or elsewhere in Massachusetts. There will be its Treasury. Connecticut can much more easily transmit its funds to New-York, than to any point in Mass. She has stronger ties to New-York than to Mass. She has done more for the American Home Missionary Society, in proportion to her population than Mass. Or, suppose Hartford or New-Haven to be the "local habitation" of the Society. Will Massachusetts send her monies there, where she has few commercial or other relations established? It is not to be expected till rivers flow upwards, and stones descend from the earth to the moon.

15. Other divisions must preclude the harmony of action. The County of Berkshire cannot act with such a Society. She has already a chartered Presbyterian and Congregational Society with funds, which must be distributed without special reference to Congregationalism. The Hampshire Missionary Society and the Massachusetts Missionary Society, cannot consistently with their charters limit their distributions to Congregational churches. Of the Connecticut Missionary Society, we cannot speak with the same assurance—but believe the same to be true of that.

16. Congregationalism in Connecticut is not the same thing as Congregationalism in Massachusetts; nor more like it than it is to Presbyterianism. And in both states there are wide diversities of theological views which will soon manifest themselves, on the formation of a new Society. We look for no such new thing under the sun as the cordial co-operation of distinct theological parties, in promoting a particular form of church order. They can harmonize, only like the iron and the clay in Nebuchadnezzar's image. Can we work with the Baptists in Home Missions? No. But why not? They are Congregationalists as well as we—nay "of the strictest sect"—and so are Unitarians; and so are Universalists—as good Congregationalists as any orthodox man in New-England. But we cannot work with them. Nor can the Taylorites and the rigid Hopkinsians work together in a distinct organization, though they have hitherto wrought harmoniously in their common relation to the American Home Missionary Society.

17. Congregationalism is already advancing at the West—and that too in the safest and surest manner possible,—by the strength of its own vital energies. This is admitted—nay urged by those who propose a new organization to promote its advancement. What more is wanted? Health is returning to the ecclesiastical body hitherto diseased. Restoration is certain, if not retarded by injudicious prescriptions. Why apply a nostrum that may quicken the operations of nature at the hazard of permanent injury to the constitution? It looks to us like the Finneyism and Buchardism that attempted a few years since to take the Lord's work out of his hand; and then did it up so bunglingly that even Satan laughs at it, as the verisimilitude of his own handy work. "Let patience have her perfect work."

18. The advance of Congregationalism by such means is not worth what it must cost. It seems to us, that there is a great mistake in regarding Congregationalism as the grand bulwark of evangelical religion. It is not so. It is the best form of government New England churches can have, no doubt. But its value does not consist in keeping "boasts and four footed things" out of its enclosures; it rather consists in leaving them free egress from its enclosures—which, however, they are not much inclined to improve. Presbyterianism, Episcopacy, &c. build their high and thick stone walls—and when an enemy gets in, it is hard work to get him out. Congregationalism has a fence around it of slight wicker work, which the enemy may leap over or break through at his pleasure, and over which he may be driven back with comparative ease. But who can pretend that Congregationalism is so mighty a bulwark of the truth, when Pelagianism, Unitarianism and Universalism and every other *ism* takes shelter within it, and feeds there securely. And so far as the churches of New England have been preserved from errors like these, it may not be clear that Congregationalism has preserved them. It is easy to affirm this, but not so easy to prove it. It is possible, to say the least, that the original stamp of New-England piety has done more to recommend Congregationalism, than Congregationalism has done to give or perpetuate the stamp of piety. Much as we value Congregationalism, it is not an idol to which we are prepared to bow down, and sacrifice the harmony and efficiency of the churches.

19. But collisions of opinion and feeling must be the unavoidable consequence of an attempt at a new organization. Not that they will rend the churches as some other denominations have been rent asunder by similar measures, for Congregationalists "have not so learned Christ;" nor will their peculiar principles, and strong love of religious liberty allow them to indulge bitterness and strife on questions of mere policy; but even the heart of the righteous may be made sad by the waywardness of his brethren, and his hands may be enfeebled while serving the Lord by their antagonistic movements. And then, the effects that will be produced on thousands of minds in the destitute regions, where the battles of Congregationalism are to be fought—the array of church against church, family against family, and individual against individual, not for conscience sake, but for carrying out a system of doubtful policy, cannot fail to obstruct the progress of truth and righteousness, and give the enemy occasion to speak reproachfully of the Christian name.

20. Our views are very imperfectly exhibited, we are well aware. But it is only in the spirit of kindness that we write, while we profess the deepest concern for the welfare of Zion, and the true honor of the Congregationalism of our Fathers.

1. Such a society is unnecessary. We have it already in the American Home Missionary Society, which is not more Presbyterian than Congregational. If we have a special desire that any portion, or the whole of our funds be appropriated exclusively to the support of Congregational churches, we have only to say so, and the American Home Missionary Society, is bound by its terms of relationship with Auxiliaries to appropriate them accordingly.

2. Such a society must involve needless expenditure of money. It must have its Secretary or Secretaries—its Treasurer—and its Agents; and all these must be supported from its funds. At the same time, the A. H. M. S. must retain all its present officers, even though its connexion with New-England be cut off. The multiplication of Societies for the same object is a great evil, as exhausting in their support a considerable portion of the public charities—and the good to be secured by their instrumentality, had still been sitting in the region of the shadow of death. We may mistake. And if so, will be thankful for correction. But our own belief is, that it has done more to break up the dead formalities of Presbyterianism, and diffuse the genial spirit of our venerated Congregational fathers, and establish and nurture Congregational churches, than all other instrumentalities combined—more by far, than could have been done by a separate Congregational organization, which must have encountered the strongest prejudices of a very threshold of its undertaking, and fallen into collision with the most fervent piety and active devotedness of the west. And we would have this union sustained—not indeed for the incidental good that attends it, in the wide diffusion of the true Congregational spirit, but for the greater good it effects in the conversion of sinners, and the edification of saints.

3. These two States have hitherto been unable to raise more than \$15,000 for expenditure on feeble churches beyond their own bounds. A new organization will not enable them to do more than this, even on the supposition that they shall be united and harmonious in action. But

4. They will not be thus united. The Society must have a location. That location may be Boston, or Worcester, or elsewhere in Massachusetts. There will be its Treasury. Connecticut can much more easily transmit its funds to New-York, than to any point in Mass. She has stronger ties to New-York than to Mass. She has done more for the American Home Missionary Society, in proportion to her population than Mass. Or, suppose Hartford or New-Haven to be the "local habitation" of the Society. Will Massachusetts send her monies there, where she has few commercial or other relations established? It is not to be expected till rivers flow upwards, and stones descend from the earth to the moon.

5. Other divisions must preclude the harmony of action. The County of Berkshire cannot act with such a Society. She has already a chartered Presbyterian and Congregational Society with funds, which must be distributed without special reference to Congregationalism. The Hampshire Missionary Society and the Massachusetts Missionary Society, cannot consistently with their charters limit their distributions to Congregational churches. Of the Connecticut Missionary Society, we cannot speak with the same assurance—but believe the same to be true of that.

6. Congregationalism in Connecticut is not the same thing as Congregationalism in Massachusetts; nor more like it than it is to Presbyterianism. And in both states there are wide diversities of theological views which will soon manifest themselves, on the formation of a new Society. We look for no such new thing under the sun as the cordial co-operation of distinct theological parties, in promoting a particular form of church order. They can harmonize, only like the iron and the clay in Nebuchadnezzar's image. Can we work with the Baptists in Home Missions? No. But why not? They are Congregationalists as well as we—nay "of the strictest sect"—and so are Unitarians; and so are Universalists—as good Congregationalists as any orthodox man in New-England. But we cannot work with them. Nor can the Taylorites and the rigid Hopkinsians work together in a distinct organization, though they have hitherto wrought harmoniously in their common relation to the American Home Missionary Society.

7. Congregationalism is already advancing at the West—and that too in the safest and surest manner possible,—by the strength of its own vital energies. This is admitted—nay urged by those who propose a new organization to promote its advancement. What more is wanted? Health is returning to the ecclesiastical body hitherto diseased. Restoration is certain, if not retarded by injudicious prescriptions. Why apply a nostrum that may quicken the operations of nature at the hazard of permanent injury to the constitution? It looks to us like the Finneyism and Buchardism that attempted a few years since to take the Lord's work out of his hand; and then did it up so bunglingly that even Satan laughs at it, as the verisimilitude of his own handy work. "Let patience have her perfect work."

8. The advance of Congregationalism by such means is not worth what it must cost. It seems to us, that there is a great mistake in regarding Congregationalism as the grand bulwark of evangelical religion. It is not so. It is the best form of government New England churches can have, no doubt. But its value does not consist in keeping "boasts and four footed things" out of its enclosures; it rather consists in leaving them free egress from its enclosures—which, however, they are not much inclined to improve. Presbyterianism, Episcopacy, &c. build their high and thick stone walls—and when an enemy gets in, it is hard work to get him out. Congregationalism has a fence around it of slight wicker work, which the enemy may leap over or break through at his pleasure, and over which he may be driven back with comparative ease. But who can pretend that Congregationalism is so mighty a bulwark of the truth, when Pelagianism, Unitarianism and Universalism and every other *ism* takes shelter within it, and feeds there securely. And so far as the churches of New England have been preserved from errors like these, it may not be clear that Congregationalism has preserved them. It is easy to affirm this, but not so easy to prove it. It is possible, to say the least, that the original stamp of New-England piety has done more to recommend Congregationalism, than Congregationalism has done to give or perpetuate the stamp of piety. Much as we value Congregationalism, it is not an idol to which we are prepared to bow down, and sacrifice the harmony and efficiency of the churches.

9. But collisions of opinion and feeling must be the unavoidable consequence of an attempt at a new organization. Not that they will rend the churches as some other denominations have been rent asunder by similar measures, for Congregationalists "have not so learned Christ;" nor will their peculiar principles, and strong love of religious liberty allow them to indulge bitterness and strife on questions of mere policy; but even the heart of the righteous may be made sad by the waywardness of his brethren, and his hands may be enfeebled while serving the Lord by their antagonistic movements. And then, the effects that will be produced on thousands of minds in the destitute regions, where the battles of Congregationalism are to be fought—the array of church against church, family against family, and individual against individual, not for conscience sake, but for carrying out a system of doubtful policy, cannot fail to obstruct the progress of truth and righteousness, and give the enemy occasion to speak reproachfully of the Christian name.

10. Our views are very imperfectly exhibited, we are well aware. But it is only in the spirit of kindness that we write, while we profess the deepest concern for the welfare of Zion, and the true honor of the Congregationalism of our Fathers.

11. Such a society is unnecessary. We have it already in the American Home Missionary Society, which is not more Presbyterian than Congregational. If we have a special desire that any portion, or the whole of our funds be appropriated exclusively to the support of Congregational churches, we have only to say so, and the American Home Missionary Society, is bound by its terms of relationship with Auxiliaries to appropriate them accordingly.

12. Such a society must involve needless expenditure of money. It must have its Secretary or Secretaries—its Treasurer—and its Agents; and all these must be supported from its funds. At the same time, the A. H. M. S. must retain all its present officers, even though its connexion with New-England be cut off. The multiplication of Societies for the same object is a great evil, as exhausting in their support a considerable portion of the public charities—and the good to be secured by their instrumentality, had still been sitting in the region of the shadow of death. We may mistake. And if so, will be thankful for correction. But our own belief is, that it has done more to break up the dead formalities of Presbyterianism, and diffuse the genial spirit of our venerated Congregational fathers, and establish and nurture Congregational churches, than all other instrumentalities combined—more by far, than could have been done by a separate Congregational organization, which must have encountered the strongest prejudices of a very threshold of its undertaking, and fallen into collision with the most fervent piety and active devotedness of the west. And we would have this union sustained—not indeed for the incidental good that attends it, in the wide diffusion of the true Congregational spirit, but for the greater good it effects in the conversion of sinners, and the edification of saints.

13. These two States have hitherto been unable to raise more than \$15,000 for expenditure on feeble churches beyond their own bounds. A new organization will not enable them to do more than this, even on the supposition that they shall be united and harmonious in action. But

14. They will not be thus united. The Society must have a location. That location may be Boston, or Worcester, or elsewhere in Massachusetts. There will be its Treasury. Connecticut can much more easily transmit its funds to New-York, than to any point in Mass. She has stronger ties to New-York than to Mass. She has done more for the American Home Missionary Society, in proportion to her population than Mass. Or, suppose Hartford or New-Haven to be the "local habitation" of the Society. Will Massachusetts send her monies there, where she has few commercial or other relations established? It is not to be expected till rivers flow upwards, and stones descend from the earth to the moon.

15. Other divisions must preclude the harmony of action. The County of Berkshire cannot act with such a Society. She has already a chartered Presbyterian and Congregational Society with funds, which must be distributed without special reference to Congregationalism. The Hampshire Missionary Society and the Massachusetts Missionary Society, cannot consistently with their charters limit their distributions to Congregational churches. Of the Connecticut Missionary Society, we cannot speak with the same assurance—but believe the same to be true of that.

16. Congregationalism in Connecticut is not the same thing as Congregationalism in Massachusetts; nor more like it than it is to Presbyterianism. And in both states there are wide diversities of theological views which will soon manifest themselves, on the formation of a new Society. We look for no such new thing under the sun as the cordial co-operation of distinct theological parties, in promoting a particular form of church order. They can harmonize, only like the iron and the clay in Nebuchadnezzar's image. Can we work with the Baptists in Home Missions? No. But why not? They are Congregationalists as well as we—nay "of the strictest sect"—and so are Unitarians; and so are Universalists—as good Congregationalists as any orthodox man in New-England. But we cannot work with them. Nor can the Taylorites and the rigid Hopkinsians work together in a distinct organization, though they have hitherto wrought harmoniously in their common relation to the American Home Missionary Society.

17. Congregationalism is already advancing at the West—and that too in the safest and surest manner possible,—by the strength of its own vital energies. This is admitted—nay urged by those who propose a new organization to promote its advancement. What more is wanted? Health is returning to the ecclesiastical body hitherto diseased. Restoration is certain, if not retarded by injudicious prescriptions. Why apply a nostrum that may quicken the operations of nature at the hazard of permanent injury to the constitution? It looks to us like the Finneyism and Buchardism that attempted a few years since to take the Lord's work out of his hand; and then did it up so bunglingly that even Satan laughs at it, as the verisimilitude of his own handy work. "Let patience have her perfect work."

18. The advance of Congregationalism by such means is not worth what it must cost. It seems to us, that there is a great mistake in regarding Congregationalism as the grand bulwark of evangelical religion. It is not so. It is the best form of government New England churches can have, no doubt. But its value does not consist in keeping "boasts and four footed things" out of its enclosures; it rather consists in leaving them free egress from its enclosures—which, however, they are not much inclined to improve. Presbyterianism, Episcopacy, &c. build their high and thick stone walls—and when an enemy gets in, it is hard work to get him out. Congregationalism has a fence around it of slight wicker work, which the enemy may leap over or break through at his pleasure, and over which he may be driven back with comparative ease. But who can pretend that Congregationalism is so mighty a bulwark of the truth, when Pelagianism, Unitarianism and Universalism and every other *ism* takes shelter within it, and feeds there securely. And so far as the churches of New England have been preserved from errors like these, it may not be clear that Congregationalism has preserved them. It is easy to affirm this, but not so easy to prove it. It is possible, to say the least, that the original stamp of New-England piety has done more to recommend Congregationalism, than Congregationalism has done to give or perpetuate the stamp of piety. Much as we value Congregationalism, it is not an idol to which we are prepared to bow down, and sacrifice the harmony and efficiency of the churches.

19. But collisions of opinion and feeling must be the unavoidable consequence of an attempt at a new organization. Not that they will rend the churches as some other denominations have been rent asunder by similar measures, for Congregationalists "have not so learned Christ;" nor will their peculiar principles, and strong love of religious liberty allow them to indulge bitterness and strife on questions of mere policy; but even the heart of the righteous may be made sad by the waywardness of his brethren, and his hands may be enfeebled while serving the Lord by their antagonistic movements. And then, the effects that will be produced on thousands of minds in the destitute regions, where the battles of Congregationalism are to be fought—the array of church against church, family against family, and individual against individual, not for conscience sake, but for carrying out a system of doubtful policy, cannot fail to obstruct the progress of truth and righteousness, and give the enemy occasion to speak reproachfully of the Christian name.

20. Our views are very imperfectly exhibited, we are well aware. But it is only in the spirit of kindness that we write, while we profess the deepest concern for the welfare of Zion, and the true honor of the Congregationalism of our Fathers.

21. Such a society is unnecessary. We have it already in the American Home Missionary Society, which is not more Presbyterian than Congregational. If we have a special desire that any portion, or the whole of our funds be appropriated exclusively to the support of Congregational churches, we have only to say so, and the American Home Missionary Society, is bound by its terms of relationship with Auxiliaries to appropriate them accordingly.

22. Such a society must involve needless expenditure of money. It must have its Secretary or Secretaries—its Treasurer—and its Agents; and all these must be supported from its funds. At the same time, the A. H. M. S. must retain all its present officers, even though its connexion with New-England be cut off. The multiplication of Societies for the same object is a great evil, as exhausting in their support a considerable portion of the public charities—and the good to be secured by their instrumentality, had still been sitting in the region of the shadow of death. We may mistake. And if so, will be thankful for correction. But our own belief is, that it has done more to break up the dead formalities of Presbyterianism, and diffuse the genial spirit of our venerated Congregational fathers, and establish and nurture Congregational churches, than all other instrumentalities combined—more by far, than could have been done by a separate Congregational organization, which must have encountered the strongest prejudices of a very threshold of its undertaking, and fallen into collision with the most fervent piety and active devotedness of the west. And we would have this union sustained—not indeed for the incidental good that attends it, in the wide diffusion of the true Congregational spirit, but for the greater good it effects in the conversion of sinners, and the edification of saints.

23. These two States have hitherto been unable to raise more than \$15,000 for expenditure on feeble churches beyond their own bounds. A new organization will not enable them to do more than this, even on the supposition that they shall be united and harmonious in action. But

24. They will not be thus united. The Society must have a location. That location may be Boston, or Worcester, or elsewhere in Massachusetts. There will be its Treasury. Connecticut can much more easily transmit its funds to New-York, than to any point in Mass. She has stronger ties to New-York than to Mass. She has done more for the American Home Missionary Society, in proportion to her population than Mass. Or, suppose Hartford or New-Haven to be the "local habitation" of the Society. Will Massachusetts send her monies there, where she has few commercial or other relations established? It is not to be expected till rivers flow upwards, and stones descend from the earth to the moon.

25. Other divisions must preclude the harmony of action. The County of Berkshire cannot act with such a Society. She has already a chartered Presbyterian and Congregational Society with funds, which must be distributed without special reference to Congregationalism. The Hampshire Missionary Society and the Massachusetts Missionary Society, cannot consistently with their charters limit their distributions to Congregational churches. Of the Connecticut Missionary Society, we cannot speak with the same assurance—but believe the same to be true of that.

26. Congregationalism in Connecticut is not the same thing as Congregationalism in Massachusetts; nor more like it than it is to Presbyterianism. And in both states there are wide diversities of theological views which will soon manifest themselves, on the formation of a new Society. We look for no such new thing under the sun as the cordial co-operation of distinct theological parties, in promoting a particular form of church order. They can harmonize, only like the iron and the clay in Nebuchadnezzar's image. Can we work with the Baptists in Home Missions? No. But why not? They are Congregationalists as well as we—nay "of the strictest sect"—and so are Unitarians; and so are Universalists—as good Congregationalists as any orthodox man in New-England. But we cannot work with them. Nor can the Taylorites and the rigid Hopkinsians work together in a distinct organization, though they have hitherto wrought harmoniously in their common relation to the American Home Missionary Society.

27. Congregationalism is already advancing at the West—and that too in the safest and surest manner possible,—by the strength of its own vital energies. This is admitted—nay urged by those who propose a new organization to promote its advancement. What more is wanted? Health is returning to the ecclesiastical body hitherto diseased. Restoration is certain, if not retarded by injudicious prescriptions. Why apply a nostrum that may quicken the operations of nature at the hazard of permanent injury to the constitution? It looks to us like the Finneyism and Buchardism that attempted a few years since to take the Lord's work out of his hand; and then did it up so bunglingly that even Satan laughs at it, as the verisimilitude of his own handy work. "Let patience have her perfect work."

28. The advance of Congregationalism by such means is not worth what it must cost. It seems to us, that there is a great mistake in regarding Congregationalism as the grand bulwark of evangelical religion. It is not so. It is the best form of government New England churches can have, no doubt. But its value does not consist in keeping "boasts and four footed things" out of its enclosures; it rather consists in leaving them free egress from its enclosures—which, however, they are not much inclined to improve. Presbyterianism, Episcopacy, &c. build their high and thick stone walls—and when an enemy gets in, it is hard work to get him out. Congregationalism has a fence around it of slight wicker work, which the enemy may leap over or break through at his pleasure, and over which he may be driven back with comparative ease. But who can pretend that Congregationalism is so mighty a bulwark of the truth, when Pelagianism, Unitarianism and Universalism and every other *ism* takes shelter within it, and feeds there securely. And so far as the churches of New England have been preserved from errors like these, it may not be clear that Congregationalism has preserved them. It is easy to affirm this, but not so easy to prove it. It is possible, to say the least, that the original stamp of New-England piety has done more to recommend Congregationalism, than Congregationalism has done to give or perpetuate the stamp of piety. Much as we value Congregationalism, it is not an idol to which we are prepared to bow down, and sacrifice the harmony and efficiency of the churches.

29. But collisions of opinion and feeling must be the unavoidable consequence of an attempt at a new organization. Not that they will rend the churches as some other denominations have been rent asunder by similar measures, for Congregationalists "have not so learned Christ;" nor will their peculiar principles, and strong love of religious liberty allow them to indulge bitterness and strife on questions of mere policy; but even the heart of the righteous may be made sad by the waywardness of his brethren, and his hands may be enfeebled while serving the Lord by their antagonistic movements. And then, the effects that will be produced on thousands of minds in the destitute regions, where the battles of Congregationalism are to be fought—the array of church against church, family against family, and individual against individual, not for conscience sake, but for carrying out a system of doubtful policy, cannot



72

100



100

...

\_\_\_\_\_



